

REMARKS

Claims 60-76 are in the application.

The title is amended to correct a typographical error noted in the Notice of Allowance, and to insert the word "substantially" in accordance with Applicant's allowed claim 60. The typographical error was only noticed upon receipt of the Notice of Allowance, and the desirability of inserting the word "substantially" in the title was also only just determined. Accordingly, Applicant could not have practically have made such requested amendments earlier, and such should be entered at this time.

There remains prior art which Applicant has properly submitted by an Information Disclosure Statement, and for which Applicant has not received Examiner-initialed PTO-1449s. Specifically, in the Office Action of July 14, 2003, the Examiner indicated that the IDS filed on January 15, 2002, had not been considered as the Examiner could not locate the references in the parent application. Regardless, Applicant's January 15, 2002, IDS filing was in accordance with the rules, and Applicant was not required to submit such references. Nevertheless, in Applicant's response filed on or about October 10, 2003, copies of all such references in such information disclosure statement were provided with that response as a courtesy to the Examiner (i.e. see paragraph 2 on page 12 of Applicant's October 10, 2003, filed response). However, initialed copies of the 1449s from such disclosure statement have not been provided to the undersigned as of this filing.

It is respectfully asserted that this is not discretionary with the Examiner, that the references must be considered, and that the undersigned must be provided with an initialed copy of the appropriately submitted 1449s. Action to that end is requested. Applicant should not be compelled to file an RCE to have such references considered, as such has been properly submitted in an IDS, and even followed-up with courtesy copies for Examiner review.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6-7-04

By: 
Mark S. Matkin
Reg. No. 32,268